



1 supporting facts or argument at all pertaining to the request to exclude testimony of Scott  
2 Wallis. *See* Dkt. #93, Ex. 1 at 11.

3 Third, many of the arguments made by Plaintiff in her proposed brief are more  
4 appropriately raised as specific objections during trial. For example, Plaintiff seeks to exclude  
5 numerous documents on the basis that they were not produced during discovery or constitute  
6 hearsay. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. #93, Ex. 1 at 15-18. Such objections may be handled during trial as  
7 documents are offered into admission, or at the pre-trial conference after the parties complete  
8 the proposed pre-trial Order that specifically includes a section noting objections to the  
9 admissibility of certain evidence.  
10

11 The Court reminds Plaintiff that Motions In Limine are used for the purpose of  
12 requesting that the Court prohibit opposing counsel from referring to or offering evidence on  
13 matters that are so highly prejudicial to the moving party that later instructions cannot cure any  
14 prejudicial effect. They are not used to address typical objections to the gamut of evidence  
15 proposed by the opposing party. Nothing in Plaintiff's proposed brief convinces this Court that  
16 she requires more than 18 pages for properly presented motions in limine. Accordingly:  
17  
18

- 19 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Overlength Brief (Dkt. #93) is DENIED.
- 20 2. To the extent that Plaintiff asserts she will simply present "pocket briefs" on the  
21 issues she cannot brief in her motion, Plaintiff is hereby directed that she SHALL  
22 NOT file any such "pocket brief" unless and until the Court requests such briefing.  
23

24 DATED this 24th day of March 2017.

25  
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
28 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE